



**SHREWSBURY PLANNING BOARD  
SHREWSBURY, MASSACHUSETTS**

**MINUTES**

Regular Meeting: May 6, 2004 - 7:00 P.M.

Location: Selectmen's Hearing Room - Municipal Office Building

**Present:** Melvin P. Gordon, Chairman  
Jonathan B. Wright, Vice-Chairman  
Jill R. Myers, Clerk  
Stephan M. Rodolakis

**Also Present:** John D. Perreault, Town Engineer  
Eric Denoncourt, Engineer/Planner

**Absent:** Kevin F. Capalbo

Mr. Gordon opened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

**1. Approve Minutes**

The Planning Board will vote on the Minutes for the April 1, 2004 meeting at their regularly scheduled meeting on June 3, 2004.

**2. Signed bills.**

**3. Meetings and Hearings**

**7:00 P.M. Board Member Comments** – There were no Board Member comments.

**7:05 P.M. Proposed Zoning Amendments, May Annual Town Meeting  
Continued Public Hearing (from April 1, 2004)**

Attending the hearing was Judy Barrett, from Community Opportunities Group. Mr. Gordon explained how the Board came to these proposed amendments. He addressed the letter from Christopher Kirk, 40 Westwood Road, who was also at the meeting.

The Board members each expressed their support and made positive comments for Articles 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, as written and being sent to the Annual Town Meeting for approval.

Brian Austin, 4 Highridge Road, said that he was a former Planning Board member in another town, and suggested that the Board consider hiring an outside engineering firm to help with development as there are firms out there that have a lot of experience developing like this. The Board felt this might be a good idea to consider.

Mr. Kirk discussed the following issues:

- 1) zoning of apartments;
- 2) Section 8.b (Dimensional, Setback and Intensity Regulations) – question on frontage requirement.

Ms. Barrett and Mr. Gordon responded to these issues.

Mr. Kirk asked questions related to Chapter 16B and Chapter 44. Mr. Morgado responded to this questions.

The Board voted to recommend making positive recommendations for Articles 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18,

**7:20 P.M.           Grand View, Section I Definitive Subdivision  
Continued Public Hearing (from February 5, 2004)  
(Decision Deadline: June 15, 2004)**

Mr. Gordon read a letter from Attorney David Brown, asking for a continuance of the hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board. The Board voted to allow the continuance.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 3, 2004, at 7:05 P.M.

**7:25 P.M.           Wagner BMW Motorcycle Dealership, Site Plan Approval  
Continued Public Hearing (from April 1, 2004)  
(Decision Deadline: 65 days from close of the hearing)**

Attending the hearing was Jeff Howland – the engineer from Graves Engineering. Mr. Howland said the return receipt green cards for notification to abutters, was submitted to Engineering the next day after last month's meeting.

Mr. Denoncourt said the lighting plan was submitted, and he has reviewed it, and it seems fine.

Mr. Gordon officially closed the hearing. The Board voted to sign the decision of approval, with conditions, for the Wagner BMW Motorcycle Dealership, as written.

**7:30 P.M.           Memorial Drive Business Park, Site Plan Approval  
Public Hearing  
(Decision Deadline: 65 days from close of the hearing)**

Attending the hearing was Attorney Richard Ricker and Edward Flynn – the developers, and John M. Grenier – the engineer from J.M. Grenier Associates, Inc.

Mr. Grenier said they want to construct an additional building on the existing site. He said they will use a landscape island to break up the parking lot, and they are providing for 29 parking spaces.

Mr. Grenier reviewed the engineering comments, and said regarding #4-dry wells, they are proposing to take roof run-off and direct it to a catch basin. He said they will be connecting into the existing septic system.

Attorney Ricker asked if they could submit the as-built within the year of occupancy. The Board and Mr. Perreault agreed that this would be okay.

Mr. Gordon officially closed the hearing.

**7:45 P.M. Highland Hill, Definitive Subdivision  
Public Hearing  
(Decision Deadline: July 13, 2004)**

Attending the hearing were Attorney Robert Cole and Attorney Joe Cariglia – the developers, and George Connors – the engineer from Connorstone Engineering.

Attorney Cole said they can address the issues of the Engineering comment letter. He said revisions will be made. He said they will also address the comments from the Fire Chief and Police Chief.

Attorney Cole made the following comments:

- 1) There is an agreement between him and Attorney David Brown – the developer for Grand View Estates, to do some work to the ‘s’ curve on High Street, to basically create a look-through, by clearing back some of the vegetation;
- 2) He said they purchased the house at 192 Prospect Street;
- 3) He commented on work to be done at 132 High Street, the Harper property;
- 4) He said they also acquired the Fields property at 60 North Street, which allowed them to move the road over, and therefore, maintain the Spruce trees, etc.; and
- 5) He said they received the letter that filing the ENF is enough.

Mr. Connors discussed the road construction and grades, the property “character,” and discussed the sewer and water. He said Engineering is asking for 30 feet of pavement.

Kim Eric Hazarvartian, from TEPP LLC, who did the traffic study, identified the areas that were analyzed. He listed what they were looking for and the conditions that were looked at. He said accidents were checked with Mass. Highway and the Police Chief. He then reviewed the traffic totals.

Attorney Cole showed the proposed road improvements at the three intersections. Mr. Connors explained the road run-off, drain system, and groundwater management plan.

Mr. Rodolakis commented as follows:

- 1) He has concerns of what the traffic study is saying about Cross and North Streets;
- 2) Commented on relocation of Veterans’ Memorial.
- 3) Commented on Ellis property.

Mr. Gordon commented as follows:

- 1) Commented on the number of garages and the effect on the traffic study;
- 2) Asked about run-off on lots 23, 24, and 25;
- 3) Asked about the rounding and right-of-way on lot #10
- 4) Plan showing off-site work should be worked out with Engineering;
- 5) Asked for description of bridge to Spring Street;
- 6) Asked what was happening with walls that are shown;
- 7) Asked about stock pile areas and phasing;
- 8) Commented on maximizing – maybe look at the number of homes with Engineering;
- 9) Commented on inclusionary by-law; and
- 10) Commented on a voluntary town donation.

Mary Wilson, 76 North Street, commented as follows:

- 1) Concern of the density;
- 2) Commented about the bridge;
- 3) Asked for clarification on some traffic definitions (a,b,c, etc.)

Bernard Seastrom, 50 North Street, commented on the following:

- 1) Attorney Cole's comment about the most impacted areas, stating he felt he was one of the most impacted;
- 2) Commented on the accident report he received from the Police Chief. Mr. Gordon asked him to get the bounds of the report from Lt. Sklut.

Lee Reid, 5 Cross Street, commented as follows:

- 1) Commented that she appreciated the presentation of the plan;
- 2) Expressed a concern about the traffic study;
- 3) Commented about sidewalks off-site; and
- 4) Commented that roads should be one way in and one way out.

Brian Austin, 4 Highridge Road, expressed the following concerns:

- 1) Commented on the widening of High Street and putting sidewalks;
- 2) Asked why streets were not coming out across from each other onto High Street

Pam Empie, 107 High Street, commented as follows:

- 1) Commented she would like a white pine buffer; and
- 2) Commented that she would not agree to property to be taken for sidewalks, and commented they should be put on the other side of the street.

Jim Curley, 3 Lantern Lane, expressed concern about the accident count, and felt it was outdated and not correct.

Henry Wood expressed concern about the traffic study, and commented that there is constant traffic from about 2:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. He also commented on the wetland area.

Jim Wilson, 76 North Street, expressed concern about the traffic with the houses going in further down the road, and asked what the count was at Prospect and Cross Streets.

Norma Bowen, 25 Cross Street, expressed concern about the accuracy of the traffic study, stating that she has trouble getting out of her driveway at 6:45 a.m.

Julie, Kalamat Farms Circle, commented that the subdivision should be contingent on the off-site road improvements.

Jeff North, 29 Cross Street, asked if the traffic study took into consideration the direction of the traffic (and turning left and right).

Kathy Ellis made the following comments:

- 1) Asked during the building of Phase I, where would the water go;
- 2) She also asked who would maintain the vegetation at the “s” curve.

Kevin Lynch, 25 North Street, asked if the traffic study included visitors coming in, what day was the count taken on, and did it take into account the change of seasons.

Mr. Gordon continued the hearing to June 3, 2004.

#### **4. New Business**

##### **a. Bond Reduction for Marshall Estates**

The Board voted to approve the bond reduction for Phases I and II for Marshall Estates Subdivision

##### **b. Summit Ridge Estates, Revised Phasing Proposal**

The Board voted to modify the Decision for Summit Ridge Estates, with changes as proposed in the letter from David Parmenter (the builder), dated April 28, 2004.

##### **c. Extension of Subdivision Control Agreement, Stone Meadow Farm Estates**

The Board voted to allow a building permit to be signed, subject to Dave Donahue and Mark Donahue reaching an agreement through Attorney Rodolakis and that a condition for Dave Donahue will be put on the building permit that an occupancy permit will not be issued until Planning Board has a \$45,000 passbook.

##### **d. Ira Avenue, ANR Plan**

The Board recommended to Mr. Perreault to deny the plan, and suggest to the applicant they go to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**5. Old Business**

**a. Discussed Stonybrook Farm II, Open Space Options**

Mrs. Catherine Peters, 10 Weagle Farm Road, attended the hearing. The Board voted to accept the offer of Cutler-Brown Development, with that condition work or money be given within a year (12 months).

**b. Discussed/Signed Decision for Wagner BMW Motorcycle**

The Board voted to sign the decision of approval, with conditions, for the Wagner BMW Motorcycle Dealership, as written.

**6. Correspondence**

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

*Annette W. Rebovich*